



Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program (MAAPP) Program Review

Montgomery County Public Schools and Montgomery College

Review Team:

Susan DePlatchett, Chair
University of Maryland

Linda Blackman
Goucher College

Leslie Faylor
Teach for America

Amber Rust
Anne Arundel Community College

MSDE Liaison:

Michelle Dunkle

Date: April 22, 2015

Type of Visit:

☐ First
☒ Continuing
☐ Probation
☐ Focused

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary for MAAPP.....	1
Part A. Introduction.....	2
Part B. Standards.....	5
Standard I.....	5
Standard II.....	9
Standard III.....	12
Standard IV.....	17
Part C. Sources of Evidence.....	21

**SUMMARY FOR MARYLAND APPROVED ALTERNATIVE
PREPARATION PROGRAM
Maryland State Department of Education**

Program: Montgomery County Public Schools and Montgomery College

Overall Level of Development: Met - Level 2

Standards		Team Findings
I	Collaboration	Met - Level 2
II	Accountability	Met - Level 2
III	Organization, Roles and Resources	Met - Level 2
IV	Diversity and Equity	Met - Level 2

PART A. INTRODUCTION

Provide a brief overview of the program.

The Montgomery College (MC) – Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) *Alternative Certification for Effective Teachers* (ACET) program is designed to provide an alternative pathway for adults with a bachelor's degree or higher and with work experience in their field of study who wish to become certified teachers but who do not need, nor desire, to earn a master's degree. This innovative and competitive program began in 2006 and is designed to address MCPS needs for excellent teachers in middle and high school high demand fields (sciences, mathematics, world languages, and technology). The content need areas may vary from year to year depending on MCPS needs.

Recruitment is on-going with new cohorts beginning each December with a four-month Teaching Institute (pre-service training). Successful candidates then enter a two-month internship (April – May). Upon successful completion of the internship, candidates meet with MCPS Human Resources representatives for placement as a resident teacher for the upcoming school year.

The program is governed by the ACET Advisory Board.

Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the program for the review, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the review.

Because of weather conditions, this review had to be rescheduled three (3) times. On the day of the actual review, April 22, one (1) visiting team member had a health issue and was unable to participate. This necessitated a revision of the day's schedule. At the request of MCPS Office of Human Resources and Development (OHRD), the revised interview schedule was again adjusted to accommodate their request to be interviewed first. The time needed to revise the schedule a second time, reduced the time that was allotted for interviews. Additionally, no principals were present for interviews, but a phone interview was conducted.

The MAAPP Program Review was held at Montgomery College. In addition to documentation sent to the review team prior to the visit, information gleaned from presentations, stakeholders, and interviews were taken into consideration when completing this report.

Following the review, one of the team members suffered a fall and was unable to complete the section assigned for an extended period of time. In addition, a computer failure necessitated extended professional technical assistance to recapture the final document prior to its submission for review.

PART B: STANDARDS

Standard I: Collaboration

MAAPP partners collaborate to implement the defined theoretical framework of the program.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard I was validated in the electronic exhibits and interviews. X Yes No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation of any factual corrections that need to be made to the Institutional Report in the space provided below. This might include information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.

I. Cross-Component (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

Ia. MAAPP partners collaborate to implement the defined theoretical framework of the program.	<u> </u> Unacceptable
	<u> </u> 1
	<u> X </u> 2
	<u> </u> 3

I. Recruitment & Selection (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners use an ongoing collaborative process to refine criteria for candidate recruitment and selection based on PreK-12 instructional and staffing priorities.	<u> </u> Unacceptable
	<u> </u> 1
	<u> </u> 2
	<u> X </u> 3

I. Pre-Employment Training (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners use a systematic process for collaboratively implementing, evaluating, and refining standards-based training that is responsive to the needs of candidates and the LSS.	<u> </u> Unacceptable
	<u> </u> 1
	<u> X </u> 2
	<u> </u> 3
b. Partners develop and implement a collaborative process for revising pre-employment training to align with the internship and residency.	<u> </u> Unacceptable
	<u> </u> 1
	<u> X </u> 2
	<u> </u> 3

I. Internship (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners use a systematic process for collaboratively implementing, evaluating, and refining standards-based training that is responsive to the needs of interns and the LSS.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
b. Partners use a systematic process for collaboratively implementing, evaluating, and refining standards-based supervision that is responsive to the needs of interns and the LSS.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
c. Partners develop and implement a collaborative process for revising the internship to align with the pre-employment training and residency.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3

I. Residency (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners use a systematic process for collaboratively designing, implementing, evaluating, and refining standards-based training that is responsive to the needs of residents and the LSS.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
b. Partners use a systematic process for collaboratively designing, implementing, evaluating, and refining standards-based mentoring that is responsive to the needs of residents and the LSS.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
c. Partners develop and implement a collaborative process for revising and enhancing the residency to align with pre-employment training and internship.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3

Summary for Standard I: Collaboration

Montgomery College (MC) and Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) work together to deliver quality teacher candidates for Montgomery county middle-schools and high-schools with a focus on teachers for mathematics, the sciences, technology, and world languages through the Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program (MAAPP) framework. The MC - MCPS partners refer to their program as Alternative Certification for Effective Teachers (ACET). The high retention rate of teachers in this program (84% over 9 cohorts) points to collaboration across the program elements and partners; however, documentation of this collaboration was limited.

The documentation provided as evidence to support collaboration between ACET partners were minutes of ACET Advisory Board Meetings (ABM). There was some confusion about these meetings, as the Human Resources/Central Office/Recruiting group referred to the ACET Working Advisory meeting and the ACET ABM with the only difference being that Mr. Jeff Martinez, Director of Recruitment and Staffing for MCPS, attended the ACET ABM. The group also indicated that the Working Advisory meeting would meet three times per year and the ABM would meet one time per year – although no one was able to give a schedule for these meetings.

The documentation that was provided (some meeting minutes which were all titled ACET ABM Minutes) indicates there is no set schedule for the meetings nor do there seem to be four meetings per year.

Minutes of ACET ABM meetings occasionally suggest there was an action item (e.g., outreach to the Asian and Hispanic communities [ACET ABM MINUTES Dec 12.pdf]). However, no information was provided in any subsequent meeting minutes to follow-up on this action item.

The interview conducted by the MAAPP Review Team with the Human Resources/Central Office/Recruiting group indicated that much of the communication and collaboration between ACET partners was done informally by phone and email. For example, in the interview, Ms. Butler explained that she received information from school principals about what their needs were for teachers. This information was relayed to MC to help to determine the make-up and size of the next cohort. However, this process is not formally documented.

Only one Meeting Agenda was provided with the initial file titled, 2 IR Standard I ACET 2015.doc. Three additional agendas were provided when asked for at the interview with Human Resources/Central Office/Recruiting group.

Additionally, Ms. Jane Butler, MCPS Staffing Coordinator, did indicate that remediation was done for candidates if needed at all points in the program; however, documentation is fragmented.

The interview with the Former & Current Resident Teachers group provided evidence to document Collaboration. They indicated that they felt the partners worked to provide a program that was well laid out for them, and that they understood what was expected of them and when it was expected. They stated that they received excellent feedback both verbal and written at all times. Documentation provided support for these statements (e.g., file Intern Eval.pdf).

The Former & Current Resident Teachers group shared concerns with “the hand-off” from the MC Internship to the MCPS Residency for hiring purposes. They stated that they had very little interaction with MC once they become resident teachers in MCPS. Discussion also revealed a need for mentor teachers to be assigned immediately at the beginning of the school year. No documentation was provided to outline how MC and MCPS handle the transition of candidates from internship to residency or the support offered.

Strengths

- Every participant of the Former & Current Resident Teachers felt that they were well versed in “MCPS speak.” This is a pleasant consequence of the collaboration between MC and MCPS to prepare these candidates to step smoothly into teaching roles for MCPS.
- Participants of the Former & Current Residents group indicated that they felt the program was well laid out and that they understood what was expected of them and when it was expected. They also felt that they received excellent feedback both verbal and written at all times.

- MCPS and MC collaborate during pre-employment training regarding MCPS instructional priorities, e.g., use of Promethean Boards and use of a common instructional language.

Recommendations

- Each partner in the ACET program delivers strong component products. However, evidence does not support that there is effective collaboration and documented communication that effectively links these components, but that they rather function as elements operating in silos.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit (if applicable): Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

AFIs from last visit (if applicable): Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

New AFIs from current review:

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

Overall Statement of Standing for Standard I

Collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Met, Level 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met, Level 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Met, Level 3
---------------	--

Standard II: Accountability

MAAPP partners conduct standards-based program evaluation and refinement based on aggregated and disaggregated candidate and program data.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard II was validated in the electronic exhibits and interviews. X Yes No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation of any factual corrections that need to be made to the Institutional Report in the space provided below. This might include information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.

II. Cross-Component (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

Ila. Partners engage in a systematic process for standards-based program evaluation and refinement based on aggregated and disaggregated candidate and program data.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
--	--

II. Recruitment & Selection (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners systematically analyze candidate and program assessment data and feedback, making appropriate changes to recruitment and selection.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
---	--

II. Pre-Employment Training (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners systematically implement and refine a process for candidate advisement, remediation and/or severance from the program.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
b. Partners systematically analyze formative and summative standards-based performance assessment data and feedback, making appropriate changes to the pre-employment training.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3

II. Internship (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners systematically use performance data and other measures to determine intern readiness for residency.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
---	--

b. Partners systematically implement and refine a process for intern advisement, remediation and/or severance from the program.	___ Unacceptable ___ 1 <u> X </u> 2 ___ 3
c. Partners systematically analyze formative and summative standards-based performance assessment data and feedback to make appropriate changes to the internship.	___ Unacceptable ___ 1 <u> X </u> 2 ___ 3

II. Residency (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners systematically use performance data and other measures to determine resident readiness for residency completion.	___ Unacceptable ___ 1 <u> X </u> 2 ___ 3
b. Partners systematically implement and refine a process for resident advisement, remediation and/or severance from the program.	___ Unacceptable ___ 1 <u> X </u> 2 ___ 3
c. Partners systematically analyze formative and summative standards-based performance assessment data and feedback, making appropriate changes to the residency.	___ Unacceptable ___ 1 <u> X </u> 2 ___ 3
d. Partners monitor teacher retention during the residency and beyond.	___ Unacceptable ___ 1 <u> X </u> 2 ___ 3
e. Residents analyze student work and achievement data and use the results for instructional decision-making.	___ Unacceptable ___ 1 <u> X </u> 2 ___ 3
f. Partners monitor resident impact on student achievement.	___ Unacceptable ___ 1 <u> X </u> 2 ___ 3

Summary for Standard II: Accountability

The Program Review team finds with Standard II that the partnership between MC and MCPS is one that works to implement and refine a process for standards-based program evaluation and refinement based on aggregated and disaggregated candidate and program data. Partnership with MC continues to be one that provides MCPS with candidates to meet their personnel needs in STEM and World Languages.

MC maintains data on demographics and retention, and evidence shows collaboration with MCPS around planning to recruit underrepresented groups. MC and MCPS work together to ensure that they are preparing candidates that will serve the needs of the school system. For example, MC and MCPS saw evidence that the World Language Praxis II did not screen adequately for their desired candidate competencies and made the decision to have World Language candidates take the ACTFL test as an alternative. Additionally, applicants to the

ACET program must interview with both MC and MCPS staff to move forward in the application process, showing collaboration between MC and MCPS.

Artifacts and interview evidence support that performance data are utilized during pre-employment, internship, and residency. Candidates collect observation documents, lesson plans, and materials in a binder that they share with their MC supervisor during the internship. The ACET Handbook outlines the specific requirements that candidates must meet to move forward at each stage.

Strengths

- The program can boast a solid retention rate throughout the program and after program completion. Eighty-four (84%) of ACET graduates remain in MCPS classrooms over nine cohorts.
- Communication about expectations for performance is clear for candidates.

Recommendations

- A formalized process documenting levels of candidate performance throughout the program should be established and maintained.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit (if applicable): Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

AFIs from last visit (if applicable): Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

New AFIs from current review:

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

Overall Statement of Standing for Standard II

Accountability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Met, Level 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met, Level 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Met, Level 3
----------------	--

Standard III: Organization, Roles & Resources

MAAPP partners establish an organizational structure that governs an MAAPP and allocates personnel and resources to meet program goals.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard II was validated in the electronic exhibits and interviews. X Yes No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation of any factual corrections that need to be made to the Institutional Report in the space provided below. This might include information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.

III. Cross-Component (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

IIIa. Partners systematically implement and refine an organizational structure for provision of shared responsibilities and resources that meet program goals.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
--	--

III. Recruitment & Selection (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners systematically implement and refine mechanisms for providing clear and consistent communication among program stakeholders throughout the recruitment and selection process.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> </u> 2 <u> X </u> 3
--	--

III. Pre-Employment Training (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners systematically implement and refine mechanisms for providing clear and consistent communication among program stakeholders throughout the pre-employment training.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
--	--

III. Internship (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners systematically implement and refine mechanisms for providing clear and consistent communication among program stakeholders throughout the internship.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
b. Partners review and refine the training of supervisors to ensure their thorough understanding of responsibilities and program benchmarks.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3

III. Residency (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners systematically implement and refine mechanisms for providing clear and consistent communication among program stakeholders throughout the residency.	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
b. Partners review and refine the training of mentors to ensure their thorough understanding of responsibilities and program benchmarks.	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
c. Residents use the structure of the LSS to negotiate their roles as employees with support from providing partners.	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3

Summary for Standard III: Organization, Roles & Resources

The evidence presented in the program report, artifacts, and interviews indicate that the MC/MCPS MAAPP program is well organized with clear roles and resources. There is an active Memorandum of Understanding between the partners for the establishment and administration of the MAAPP program. The program is governed by an Advisory Board that includes representatives of both the college and the school system as well as former participants teaching in the school system. The membership of the advisory board enables all partners to provide input on program progress and upgrades. One principal indicated that his membership on the Advisory Board “makes collaboration an easier avenue.” The roles and responsibilities of specific MC and MCPS personnel are clearly delineated in the document *Alternative Certification for Effective Teachers (ACET) Roles and Responsibilities*. These roles and responsibilities were confirmed by the personnel present at panel interviews.

Collaboration is especially evident in the recruitment and selection process as shown in the artifact, *Montgomery College/Montgomery County Public Schools Procedures for Selection and Employment/Certification of ACET Educator* and affirmed during the panel interviews. Recruitment documents are present on the websites of both partners. Montgomery College staff and MCPS staff together are involved in the review of applications, interviews and selection of candidates. Interview questions are developed collaboratively and revised based on program feedback. For example, a response to the visiting team’s clarifying questions indicates that for Fall 2014 interviews, the interview questions were revised to specifically address the areas of persistence and dispositions. Notably, unanimous agreement of all parties is required for candidate selection.

Artifacts and interviews reflect that pre-employment training is primarily the purview of Montgomery College and is delivered through the modules of their Teaching Institute. However, answers to clarifying questions posed by the team indicate that initially the program was developed collaboratively and that changes in the topics or emphases of the training modules provided in the Teaching Institute are driven by survey feedback from mentors and principals and suggestions by the Advisory Board. A clarifying question response gives the example that, as a result of feedback, “the number of class meetings for modules on students with

exceptionalities has increased over time, as has the content on diversity.” The ACET handbook contains the syllabus for pre-employment training with descriptions of the modules provided.

Multiple sources including the *ACET Teaching Internship Course Syllabus*, the *MC/MCPS Procedures for Selection and Employment/Certification of ACET Educator*, the *ACET: Resident Teacher Program On-Site Supervising Teacher’s Responsibilities*, the Cooperating Teacher Survey results, and interviews confirm that the internship phase of the program involves shared responsibilities and communication between MC and MCPS staff. The procedures document states that the candidates are placed in their internships in cooperation with MCPS staff. During the internship, regular communication occurs between the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher (on-site supervising teacher). As described in the internship syllabus, the assessment of interns, in particular, is a shared responsibility. For example, professional competencies are measured by the scores from three observations by the college supervisor and two evaluations by the cooperating teacher. The college supervisor and the cooperating teacher review daily lesson plans and feedback is provided to the intern. Results of the Cooperating Teacher Survey indicate that 83.3% of those responding agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “The MC college supervisor communicated with me throughout the internship.” 100% of cooperating teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “The MC college supervisor communicated the role and responsibility of being a cooperating teacher clearly.” Additionally, 100% of cooperating teachers indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “I understand the structure and philosophy of the ACET program.” Input from MCPS cooperating teachers is also sought in the survey regarding program needs and enhancements when they are asked to identify the teaching skills most evident in their interns and those most lacking, and to suggest what training might be added to the Teaching Institute. A principal interviewed by the team explained that prior to interns beginning at a school site, MC staff meets with the principals to communicate regarding each intern’s strengths and needs. One principal indicated that the presentation on the interns is thorough and he finds the “upfront and personal interaction” to be very helpful. The internship operates according to the regulations of MCPS on the Student Teacher/Intern Program: Selection of Supervising Teachers and Assignment of College Students.

Artifacts and interview responses indicate that while clear structures and supporting materials are in place for the residency, the residency is primarily the purview of MCPS with the exception of the Teacher Seminar and Action Research Seminar taught by MC. There do not appear to be avenues of communication among those who supported the candidate during the internship and those who will be supporting the candidate during the residency. During an interview session, this transition was described as a “hand off” of the candidate from MC to MCPS. Supervision and support of the candidate during the residency is provided by a consulting teacher from MCPS and a mentor teacher within the school. Residents who are experiencing difficulties are supported by the consulting teacher and a MCPS resource teacher with no involvement of MC. A written response to a clarifying question regarding interventions for struggling candidates states that “During the residency, teaching performance interventions are managed in general by the Consulting Teacher, along with help from the mentor teacher, but specific documents are not placed in files to be reviewed by MC staff except as requested.” Mentor teachers keep an electronic running log of contact with, activities engaged in, and support given/needed with their mentees and this is shared with MCPS human resources only. The responsibilities of the mentors are clearly delineated in a MCPS document, *Mentor Expectations 2014-2015*. This

document is for mentors of all new teachers and includes a description of the mentor training available through MCPS and the expectation that “mentors should be trained.” The residents are given the MCPS *Teacher PGS Handbook*, provided for all new teachers, that contains guidelines for teachers regarding expectations and the performance review process.

Strengths

- The program has shown a commitment to collaboration and program improvement through the establishment of the advisory board, as it provides a venue for communication among stakeholders.
- The team was impressed by the program materials, such as the ACET Handbook, the MCPS Teacher PGS Handbook, the ACET: Roles and Responsibilities document and the ACET: Resident Teacher Program On-Site Supervising Teacher’s Responsibilities document. These materials indicate the presence of clear processes and well-defined roles and responsibilities.
- Strong collaboration and shared responsibilities between program partners during the Recruitment and Selection and Internship phases of the program are evident.
- The analysis of survey data and retention data is used to drive program improvement.

Recommendations (Please use a bulleted list.)

- ACET partners must share responsibility for all parts of the program from recruitment through the completion of residency. Evidence suggests that the transition from internship to residency is more like a “hand off” from MC to MCPS.
- Evidence supports a need for clear, systemic structures for all partners, including principals and other school-based leaders, supervisors, and mentors, to understand the requirements, evaluative criteria, responsibilities and partner roles in all phases of the program.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit (if applicable): Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

AFIs from last visit (if applicable): Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

New AFIs from current review:

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

Overall Statement of Standing for Standard III

Organization, Roles & Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Met, Level 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met, Level 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Met, Level 3
---------------------------------	--

Standard IV: Diversity & Equity

MAAPP partners apply Maryland standards of diversity and equity in the recruitment, selection and preparation of candidates to support equitable outcomes for diverse learners within the MAAPP and LSS.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard II was validated in the electronic exhibits and interviews. X Yes No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation of any factual corrections that need to be made to the Institutional Report in the space provided below. This might include information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.

IV. Cross-Component (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

IVa. Partners systematically refine implementation of MD standards of diversity and equity to support equitable outcomes for diverse learners within the MAAPP and LSS.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
---	--

IV. Recruitment & Selection (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners use recruitment data to determine sources for diverse candidates and target recruitment efforts accordingly.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> X </u> 1 <u> </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
--	--

IV. Pre-Employment Training (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners refine pre-employment training to promote candidate understanding of diverse PreK-12 learners.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
b. Partners refine pre-employment assessments to ensure that candidates demonstrate the knowledge necessary to work with diverse learners.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
c. Partners use disaggregated candidate data to refine pre-employment training to ensure support for a diverse candidate population.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3

IV. Internship (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners provide a diverse population of interns with supported experiences working with diverse PreK-12 learners.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
b. Interns demonstrate the ability to successfully work with diverse learners.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3

IV. Residency (Place an X next to the appropriate level.)

a. Partners refine ongoing training related to diversity and equity based on data and feedback.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
b. Partners refine supports appropriate to a diverse resident population.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
c. Residents demonstrate ability to differentiate instruction for diverse learners.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3
d. Residents demonstrate skill in working with diverse PreK-12 student, family, staff and community populations.	<u> </u> Unacceptable <u> </u> 1 <u> X </u> 2 <u> </u> 3

Summary for Standard IV: Diversity & Equity

Major goals of the ACET Partnership have been to recruit a group of candidates whose diversity is reflective of the children in MCPS and to prepare all ACET candidates to teach diverse and at-risk students. The Institutional Report and information obtained through presentations and interviews provide evidence that ACET partners continue to work to meet these over-arching goals.

ACET Advisory Board minutes provide evidence that recruitment and selection of diverse candidates is regularly discussed. Minutes note an effort to reach out to the Asian American Educators' group and to MC contacts in the Hispanic community; however, there was no follow-up information provided in subsequent minutes to document and/or evaluate this outreach. It was also suggested that partners might want to review minority recruitment efforts in other MAAPP programs. The 2014 MCPS Teacher Workforce Diversity Initiative report documents that minority hiring is a priority throughout MCPS. One ACET interview question, in particular, asks for the applicant's thoughts on working with diverse learners – ELL, learning disabled, low SES, diverse backgrounds.

Artifacts and interviews document that Pre-Employment Training is a strong component of the ACET program. The eight modules of the three month Teaching Institute taught by MC faculty

are regularly reviewed and adapted as necessary to provide candidates with skills they will need to be successful in their Internship and Residency. Of particular importance to preparing all ACET candidates to teach diverse and at-risk students are the modules *Diversity and Culturally Responsive Teaching*, *Teaching Students with Exceptionalities*, and *Collaboration and Communication Skills*. The Teaching Institute/Pre-Employment Training continues to be refined based on feedback from ACET partners.

When candidates begin the Internship phase of the ACET program (approximately six weeks in length), artifacts show that they are placed in schools with diverse student populations. This enables the candidates to demonstrate the ability to successfully work with diverse students while they are being supported and observed by both MC and MCPS.

Once candidates successfully complete the Internship, they interview for positions as classroom teachers and are subsequently placed by MCPS Human Resources (HR). Candidates are not always able to be placed in schools with diverse student populations, although that is the focus of the ACET program. Interviews with ACET residents and graduates revealed that direct classroom support from MC diminished during the Residency while MCPS picked up the support and supervision. The ACET residents participated in on-going professional development provided to all first-year teachers in MCPS. They also participated in monthly seminars held by MC for their ACET cohort.

Each year, at the conclusion of the Residency component, ACET residents, supervisors, mentors, and principals are asked for feedback regarding the strength and needs of the ACET program. This information is used to refine the Teaching Institute. As one result of this feedback, the class modules for students with exceptionalities and for diversity have been expanded.

The artifact *ACET Program Demographics by Cohort Year* shows that while there are many non-white applicants to the ACET program, they are not always admitted or, if admitted, may not complete the program. The Institutional Report states “from the program perspective, it is more important that program completers are truly prepared to teach in diverse and at-risk classroom populations, even if this means not all candidates who enter will be completers.” The success and retention of the ACET program completers since the inception of the program would give strong evidence to the preparation for teaching diverse and at-risk students.

Strengths

- There is a strong component in the pre-internship training to include all elements of diversity. Former and current resident teachers spoke highly of the preparation for teaching in the diverse schools within MCPS. They spoke of this as a “constant drumbeat for equity and equity issues” in their schools, their classrooms, and in themselves.
- Although former and current resident teachers offered constructive suggestions for program improvements during the interviews, they stated that they felt profoundly well prepared to undertake their teaching assignments and were confident in expressing their honest opinions about the ACET program.

- Partners in the ACET program have provided feedback that is used to make needed adjustments to better prepare the candidates for MCPS classrooms.

Recommendations (Please use a bulleted list.)

- None

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit (if applicable): Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

AFIs from last visit (if applicable): Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

New AFIs from current review:

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

Overall Statement of Standing for Standard IV

Diversity & Equity	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Met, Level 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met, Level 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Met, Level 3
--------------------	--

PART C. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Documents and Artifacts Reviewed

Partnership Profile

- MSDE Approval Letters (2006 and 2014)
- Framework - InTASC Standards, MCPS Professional Standards, Maryland Technology Standards and ACET Modules
- Middle Level Alignment Chart
- ACET Organizational Chart
- 2015 Cohort Participant Handbook – Alternative Certification for Effective Teachers

Artifacts Reviewed for Standard I

- Theoretical Framework for ACET
- Montgomery College 2020 Publication
- MCPS Building Our Future Together Brochure
- ACET Advisory Board Minutes 5/1/2012, 12/12/2012, 7/2/2013
- Interview Questions 2011
- Interview Questions with Benchmarks 2014
- Website page for Application Process
- Communication/Announcement for ACET Interest Meeting on 3/31/2014
- Documentation of ACET Interviews
- Teaching Institute Syllabus 2014
- Feedback Summary regarding Teaching Institute
- ACET Schedule for 2014 and 2015 Teaching Institute
- Copy of Completed Intern Evaluation
- Teaching Portfolio for Math Candidate
- Syllabus for Action Research – Fall 2013 and 2014
- Final Action Research Projects from two students
- List of ACET Mentor and Teachers by School
- MCPS Mentor Expectations and Guidelines

Artifacts Reviewed for Standard II

- 2014 MC-MCPS ACET MAAPP Report
- Sample Applicant File
- 2015 ACET Handbook
- Framework - InTASC Standards, MCPS Professional Standards, Maryland Technology Standards and ACET Modules
- ACET Demographics for 2010 Cohort
- ACET Advisory Board Minutes 5/1/2012, 12/12/2013
- Sample Intern Evaluation
- Teaching Portfolio for Math Candidate
- Program Feedback Summary 7/18/2014
- MCPS Professional Growth System Handbook

- ACET Cumulative Record (2006-2015)
- Syllabus for Action Research – Fall 2014
- Notification letter for non-completion of program
- Warning Letter with Expectations for Completion of Residency

Artifacts Reviewed for Standard III

- Advisory Board Minutes 12/12/2012
- Listing of 2014 ACET Advisory Board Members
- ACET Memorandum of Understanding
- Chart Outlining Roles and Responsibilities of ACET Personnel and Partners
- MC/MCPS Procedures for Selection and Employment/Certification of ACET Educator
- Presentation from ACET Information Sessions
- ACET Recruitment Brochure
- Program Websites
- Orientation/Registration Information sent to Program Candidates
- Email sent to Advisory Board Members regarding Candidate Selection
- ACET Advisory Board Minutes 12/12/2012
- 2015 ACET Handbook
- ACET Teaching Internship Syllabus 2008/2009
- MCPS Student Teaching Regulations and Guidelines
- Supervising Teacher Guidelines
- MCPS Professional Growth System Handbook
- Mentor Expectations and Guidelines
- Mentor Training Opportunities in MCPS
- Email from ACET graduate selected to be a speaker at MCPS New Educator Orientation
- Program Feedback Summary 7/18/2014

Artifacts Reviewed for Standard IV

- ACET Recruitment Brochure
- MC Website regarding ACET Program
- MCPS Non-Discrimination Policy
- ACET Demographics for 2010 Cohort
- Teaching Institute Syllabus 2014
- ACET Advisory Board Minutes 5/1/2012, 12/12/2013
- ACET Entry Requirement Checklist
- Interview Questions with Benchmarks
- Announcement regarding MCPS Workforce Diversity Initiative 12/16/2014
- MCPS Factsheets on ACET Placement Schools: Northwood HS, Einstein HS, Magruder HS
- Teaching Portfolio for Math Candidate
- Copy of Completed Final Evaluation from Supervisor
- Syllabus for Action Research – Fall 2014

Responses to Clarifying Questions

- Written Responses to Clarifying Questions

- ACET Advisory Board Minutes – December 11, 2014
- ACET Cumulative Record (2006-2015)
- Action Research Proposal for Physics
- MHEC CC-10 Request for State Funding of a Continuing Education Course – FY2011
- Cohort Year Demographics
- Completion of Residency Letter
- Culturally Responsive Teaching Plan
- Diversity Assessment
- Template - Intern Final Evaluation with Rubrics
- Copy of Completed Final Evaluation from Supervisor
- Interest Meeting Posting 2/3/2015
- Lesson Feedback
- Notification letter for non-completion of program
- Warning Letter with Expectations for Completion of Residency
- Flyer for Teaching as a Profession course sponsored by MC
- ACET Interview Questions

Additional Requested Artifacts (available on day of MAAPP Review)

- Action Research in Chemistry (2)
- Action Research in Math (1)
- Draft Proposal for SLO Plan used for Action Research in Physics (1)
- Samples of Culturally Responsive Teaching Plans (3)
- Samples of Diversity Reflections with Implicit Project Tests (2)

Program Panel and Interviewees

Description	Name	Role
Program Director	Dr. Deb Poese	Director, School of Education, MC
LSS Superintendent or Designee	Dr. Susan Marks	Acting Associate Superintendent for Human Resources and Development
Program Instructors	Dr. Glenda Baca Dr. Diane Switlick	Faculty, School of Education, MC
Other IHE Partner Representatives	Dr. Darrin Campen Dr. Dorothy Umans Dr. Brenda Delaney Dr. Carol Levine	Dean, Education and Social Sciences, MC MC Dean, Community Education and Extended Learning, MC Instructional Specialist for Higher Education Partnerships, MCPS Internship Supervisor, MC (MCPS Retired)

Internship Mentors, Supervising/Cooperating Teachers	Dr. Carol Levine Mr. Charles Piety Mr. Andre Weichbod Ms. Kirsten Jackson	Internship Supervisor, MC (MCPS Retired) Magruder HS Clarksburg HS, Tech Ed John F. Kennedy HS
Principals	n/a	n/a
MCPS HR Officers	Mr. Jeff Martinez Ms. Jane Butler Dr. Inger Swimpson	Director, Recruitment & Staffing Staffing Coordinator Director, Certification & Continuing Education
MCPS Certification Specialist	Ms. Marie Bercaw	Certification Coordinator
Current & Former Resident Teachers	Mr. Daniel Bates Ms. Susan Dahiya Ms. Erica Bader Mr. Charles Piety Ms. Amysu Soldavini	Wheaton HS, Physics Northwood HS/E. Brooke Lee MS/French Mathematics, Einstein HS Magruder HS, Chemistry Meadow Hall ES/Media Specialist